

R E M A R K S

O N T H E

P A P E R S

Relative to the

R U P T U R E with S P A I N,

Occasioned by the

O B S E R V A T I O N S on the Same.



L O N D O N :

Printed for J. COOKE, at Shakespeare's-Head, in
Pater-noster-Row. 1762.

THE NEW YORK

OF THE

THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK

R E M A R K S

O N T H E

P A P E R S, &c.

HAVING heard people confidently affirm, that the Pamphlet, containing Observations relative to the Rupture with Spain, was Mr. P—'s own, I was induced to inspect it; but soon perceiving the want of the grand characteristick of that Gentleman's productions, both in speaking and writing, which are embellished

B

bellished

bellished with a language of his own formation, beyond the reach of Grammar and Dictionary, I rejected the report ; and, on farther enquiry, was told, that it was written with his approbation, and composed of his materials. But as that worthy Patriot, in an Honourable Assembly, very lately recommended, with great apparent earnestness, an amnesty of every thing past, and express'd his warmest hopes, that we would look forwards only, and unanimously concur in joint efforts for the public good, I cannot yet prevail on myself to believe, that it came, in any shape, from that Gentleman ; for is it possible, that he should so soon forget his declarations, as to be the first to disturb that peace, which he advised, with such uncounterfeited sincerity ? By what hard fate can one suppose him, doomed to a conduct, directly opposite to his most solemn professions ? Has he ever shewn himself guilty of inconsistencies, and self-contradictions ? ---- Many people com-
mended

mended much this speech, which seemed calculated to promote the behaviour just mentioned, and looked on it, as the best and wisest which he had ever made; for this reason, amongst many others, more weighty perhaps, that the longer and stricter the enquiry, the worse a certain cause, which possibly he may have some inclination to support, would appear.

As to the contents of the book, the author boasts what he could have done, had all letters, for six years past, been published. Is he conscious, then, how little able he is to defend his patron from what doth appear? The world however in general seems content with the light which has been thrown on those affairs.

I do not wonder this Gentleman is not. As our author has began a dispute, by a comparison of these letters, which I wish had, and perhaps would better have been left dormant, I will beg leave to consider them,

in one light, in which he has not examined them ; I mean in point of decency ; and, that point having been considered, will proceed to what seems his object, business. The other part I do not by any means blame him for passing over in silence, for which perhaps there will appear sufficient reason. Business is certainly the most essential consideration ; yet decency is an useful concomitant, and even necessary for carrying on business. I must submit to the consideration of others, whether, in the one only dispatch, which we here find of Mr. P---'s, somewhat of that haughtiness of temper, which has been complained of, on other occasions, doth not appear, with respect to our S----n. For instance, p. 1. " The King's servants were unanimously of opinion," without any mention hitherto made of the King, but as relative to his servants, and as tending only to describe their more considerable personages. He proceeds, " and submitted to " his Majesty, that a peremptory declaration, &c." the servants all the while, notwithstanding-

withstanding the formal use of the word *submitted* furnishing the *primum mobile*. Doth not this surpass the famous *Ego & Rex meus*? for, in Cardinal *Wolsey's* expression, the King is made a principal as well as the Cardinal. Would not one think that the Crown was in tutelage? If it had been in tutelage, would this have been a proper respect observed towards it? —And yet this regards a King, who, not only for his goodness, is the object of his people's adoration, but is equally esteemed on account of his abilities.

I should abuse my reader's time, was I to detain him, in examining the performance before me, from first to last; it would be endless to animadvert on every thing which lies open to animadversion. But to give a specimen of what is to be expected from this Gentleman's impartiality, candour, and abilities, I will select from many things (which do not at all fall short of this particular one, which I shall
cite,

cite, in any of the above-mentioned respects)
 a passage, in which Lord Egremont and
 the new ministry (to use his own phrase)
 are censured, with as great facility and heed-
 lessness as severity. It begins, p. 37. " Let
 " me next remark how dextrous the new
 " ministry here were in endeavouring to
 " deceive themselves. In the answer deli-
 " vered to the Count de Fuentes by the
 " Earl of Egremont, Dec. 31, it is said the
 " ambassador at the court of Madrid, by
 " a dispatch dated the 28th of October,
 " was ordered to demand in terms the
 " most measured, however, and the most
 " amicable, a communication of the treaty
 " recently concluded between the courts of
 " Madrid and Versailles, or, at least, of the
 " articles which might relate to the inte-
 " rest of Great Britain, and TO CONTENT
 " HIMSELF WITH ASSURANCES, in case
 " the Catholic King offered to give any,
 " that the said engagements did not contain
 " any thing that was contrary to the
 " friendship which subsisted between
 " the

“ the two crowns, or that was prejudicial to the interests of Great Britain, “ supposing that any difficulty was made “ of shewing the treaty.” Page 48. of the Spanish Papers, Quarto edition.

The new ministry are now got off from the true ground, which was the memorial of Spanish affairs verbatim sent from Madrid, and the letter of Lord Bristol's of August 31, with the inclosures; and have confined their view to the single point of the late treaty, or the family-compact. Every thing relative to the final intentions of Spain, concerning which Lord Bristol is ordered in Mr. Pitt's letter, so early as July 28, to come to categorical and satisfactory declarations, is omitted in this demand, and Lord Bristol is ordered to confine himself to the new treaty. This I agree with Lord Egremont is certainly “ no equivocal proof of dependance on the “ good faith of the Catholic King, in shewing him an unbounded confidence in so “ important

“ important an affair,” P. 49, Spanish Papers. How merited, we have seen from what passed in the latter months of the negotiation ; and in all probability should see more glaringly, if the whole negotiation, since the accession of his present Catholic Majesty, were communicated to us. From that *unbounded confidence* the new ministry lost sight of the most offensive and hostile matter in the memorial of July 23, and the papers of August 31, attacking the dignity of the crown of England, in a manner surely far more unbecoming and insolent than that spirit of haughtiness and discord, which, says Mr. Wall, “ dictated that “ inconsiderate step, and which, for the “ misfortune of mankind, still reigns so “ much in the British government, which “ made in the same instant the declaration “ of war, and attacked the King’s dignity.” Spanish Papers, p. 67.

It is plain they were accommodating themselves at any rate tamely to become the
dupes

dupes of Spain ; for all they desired by the dispatch of the 28th of October, was an assurance of the *innocence of the treaty* in question (pag. 23, Spanish papers) and they passed by every thing else, though of the most hostile tendency. Conscious of this, Lord Egremont, at the end of his answer to the Count de Fuentes, December 31, pleads guilty, for himself and his brother ministers, to the charge that may be exhibited against them, of an intentionally facile and willing credulity, when he says, “ But fortunately the terms, in which the “ declaration*(Fuentes’s) is conceived, spare “ us the regret of not having received it “ sooner ; for it appears at first sight, that “ the answer is not at all conformable “ to the demand. We wanted to be in- “ formed, if the court of Spain intended

* That the said treaty is only a convention between the family of Bourbon, wherein there is nothing that has the least relation to the present war. Fuen- te’s note, delivered to Lord Egremont, Dec. 25.

“ to join the French, our enemies, to make
 “ war on Great Britain, or to depart
 “ from their neutrality? Whereas the an-
 “ swer concerns one treaty only (all that
 “ was asked by the dispatch of 28th of Oc-
 “ tober) which is said to be of the 15th
 “ of August, carefully avoiding to say
 “ the least word, that could explain, in
 “ any manner, the intentions of Spain to-
 “ wards Great Britain, or the further engage-
 “ ments they have contracted in the present
 “ crisis.” In the dispatch indeed of Lord
 Egremont to Lord Bristol, of November
 19th, in answer to Lord Bristol’s letter of
 November 2, pag. 32, the new ministry
 amend their own question, and at last de-
 mand “ a precise and categorical answer
 “ from the court of Madrid, relative to their
 “ intention with regard to Great Britain in
 “ this critical conjuncture,” which brought
 on the rupture, on the 10th of December,
 and is precisely what was directed by Mr.
 Pitt so early as July 28.

So

So far the Observator on the Papers relative to the Rupture with Spain. — As to the first part of the charge, the only excuse, which I can devise, in favour of the Author, is a presumption that he is subject to deliriums, and was actually under that disorder at the time of writing; in which case his friends are the persons to blame, who did not debar him from pen and ink, knowing his itch for publishing; for surely he was not sensible, that he was making citations from a piece drawn by Lord Egremont, for justification of the nation, in the eyes of Europe, at a time, when the crisis was over, and a rupture commenced, and not from the instructions sent to the British ambassador at Madrid, while those affairs were in agitation. — If the writer was not disturbed in his understanding, I hope, for the honour of my country, that he is not an Englishman. I must and will insist, that England could not have given birth to a man, who, while an English officer of state, in the proper and necessary execution of his duty,

is setting forth the moderation of his nation, to the greatest advantage, and is combating a Spaniard in front, takes advantage of that situation, in that instant attacks him in flank, and attempts driving a poignard to heart. I must and will insist, that no Briton could be guilty of such an act, which must excite, not only the indignation of his fellow citizens, but even the scorn of a generous enemy. And yet we find another instance of the same black nature, p. 41. of this same performance.

But do not the letters themselves, sent by Lord Egremont to the British Ambassador at Madrid, lie open to the view of the whole world? Take then that ground; examine there the propriety of Lord Egremont's conduct.

In the dispatch of October the 28th (pag. 21. of the Spanish papers) Lord Egremont's words are, "As the court of France
" has affected to give out that Spain was
" on

“ on the point of entering into the war,
 “ which language has been industriously
 “ propagated, in most courts of Europe ;
 “ his Majesty therefore thinks that the Ho-
 “ nour of his Crown, and the Interests of
 “ his People, equally call for an explanation
 “ with regard to this already too much
 “ credited report.” And in the same dis-
 patch of October the 28th (pag. 22. of
 the Spanish papers) it is said, “ It is there-
 “ fore the King’s pleasure, that your Ex-
 “ cellency should use the most pressing in-
 “ stances to Mr. Wall to obtain such com-
 “ munication as is above-mentioned.”

In another letter of the same date,
 October the 28th, secret and confidential,
 the Ambassador is instructed in the man-
 ner following. “ In case you find in-
 “ superable objections to such a communi-
 “ cation as is expected in my most secret
 “ letter of this date, and that in lieu
 “ thereof it should be proposed to give his
 “ Majesty solemn assurances of the inno-
 “ cence

“ cence of the treaty in question with re-
 “ spect to the King’s interests ; in such
 “ case, your Excellency is not totolly to
 “ reject the alternative, but to take it *ad*
 “ *referendum* to be transmitted to your
 “ court: Provided always that the said
 “ assurances be given upon his Catholic
 “ Majesty’s royal word, signified in writing
 “ either by the Spanish Secretary of State
 “ to your Excellency, or by the Conde
 “ de Fuentes to the King’s Secretary of
 “ State here, and not otherwise.”

In the first place, From these quotations it is manifest, that not only a communication of the treaty, but an explanation with regard to the intentions of Spain for entering into the war, was demanded by this dispatch of October the 28th, and the *most pressing instances* required to be used for obtaining it.—Either then I must take shame to myself, as having quoted words not to be found in the letters, or that will lie at this Author’s door, from
 which

which honour (I hope) will ever protect mine: The Reader will easily decide on this affair, by having recourse to the letters themselves.

In the second place, Any man, who shall examine this dispatch, with expectations from this Gentleman's assurances, of finding any mention of the 15th of August, will be greatly disappointed. Not one word of the 15th of August is there; and the treaty is described, only by these words, "The treaty acknowledged to have been
"concluded between the courts of Madrid
"and Versailles, or of such articles thereof,
"as can by particular and explicit engagements, immediately relate to the interest
"of Great Britain, or in a more distant
"or general view of affairs, be any ways
"construed to affect the same in the present conjuncture." This treaty is mentioned in Mr. Pitt's letter to Lord Bristol of the 28th of July 1761, as acknowledged by the D. de Choiseul, to have had its
existence

existence before the first overtures of France for the particular peace with England; that is, before the 26th of March 1761. Nor doth any thing appear, relative to the 15th of August, till after the rupture, in the note, delivered by the Count de Fuentes, to the Earl of Egremont, October 25th, 1761, which is answered the 31st of the same month by the Earl of Egremont, in whose answer the evasive distinction of a particular treaty, concluded the 15th of August, is, with proper spirit, ridiculed and exploded; and yet, from this very action of rejecting the intended imposition, as soon as offered, this Author argues an intentionally facile and willing credulity in the new ministry; so that for the future (I suppose) if one sees a man walk with uncommon agility, one ought to conclude, that he has not the use of his legs, or that he cannot mount a horse, because one sees him ride. In all probability the engagements of Spain, taken with France, relative
to

to Great Britain, were previous to January 1761, as will be shewn hereafter.

This writer says, "The new ministry are now got off the true ground, which was the memorial of Spanish affairs, verbatim sent from Madrid, (from which by the by Mr. Pitt instructed Lord Bristol to open a retreat, provided the final intentions were explained) and the letter of Lord Bristol's of August 31, with the enclosures; and have confined their view to the single point of the late treaty, or the family-compact. Every thing, relative to the final intentions of Spain, concerning which Lord Bristol is ordered, in Mr. Pitt's letter, so early as July 28, to come to categorical and satisfactory declarations, is omitted in this demand, and Lord Bristol is ordered to confine himself to the new treaty." In this affirmation, we have proved, from the letters themselves, that this gentleman has the misfortune of not being seconded by the best friend which a man can have, viz.

D

Truth.

Truth. — And as to distinctions made between treaties and intentions, he rings the changes on these words, till he works himself into perplexity.

Lord Egremont, in his answer to Count Fuentes, dated 31st December, with great propriety, distinguisheth between treaties containing hostile intentions, and treaties not containing hostile intentions; if he meant to adopt his thoughts, he lost Lord Egremont's idea, and attained none of his own. For it is evident enough, that, in some late treaty (tho' perhaps not in that of the 15th August, yet in the other probably mentioned by the Duke de Choiseul, as previous to the overtures from France) the intentions and resolutions of Spain (if she had really formed any hostile ones) were declared, in written engagements with France; because it is impossible to suppose, if she intended, and was fully determined to join with France against Great Britain, that she would neglect reaping all the advantages
which

which she could claim from such merit, by express stipulations with France ; from which it appears, that, to know the contents of the treaty, made between France and Spain, relative to Great Britain (of whatever date it was) and to know the disposition of Spain towards Great Britain, whether hostile or no, amounted to the same thing. This remark neither tends to justify or blame the new ministry, and serves only to shew, what one is to expect from the clearness of the understanding of this writer, who raises a phantom from his own brain, in order to fight it.

I have but one farther remark to make on this specimen, which I have selected; it is that part where the author says, “ In
 “ the dispatch indeed of Lord Egremont’s
 “ to Lord Bristol, of November 19, in an-
 “ swer to Lord Bristol’s of November 2,
 “ p. 32, the new ministry amend their
 “ own question, and at last demand a pre-
 “ cise and categorical answer from the

“ court of Madrid, relative to their inten-
 “ tion with regard to Great Britain, in this
 “ critical conjuncture ; which brought on
 “ the rupture on the 10th of December,
 “ and is precisely what was directed by
 “ Mr. Pitt, as early as July 28.” The
 rupture was brought on by the declara-
 tion which Lord Bristol, by Lord Egremont’s instructions, was ordered to make,
 viz. that a refusal of an explanation would
 not be looked on by his Majesty in any
 other light, but as an aggression on the part
 of Spain, and as an absolute declaration of
 war.

In Mr. Pitt’s dispatch of July 28, no in-
 struction of this sort is to be found ; which,
 however, was no more than in common
 prudence was necessary, previous to a de-
 claration of war ; for Spain might have
 been governed, in her equivocal behaviour,
 by various other motives, than a real dispo-
 sition of attacking Great Britain. It would
 be easy to mention many, which, though
 not

not founded perhaps in sound judgment, still are not so far removed from it, as an actual intention of entering into war with Great Britain, since experience has shewn, that when, in contradiction to the obvious principles of common interest, harmony has been unhappily interrupted between the two nations, Spain has always been the greatest sufferer.—But the chicanery, insolence, and perfidy of Spain had, it seems, been enormous during six years negotiation. I hope, however, for the honour of our Great Minister himself, this country has not suffered, for six years past, insults from Spain, which ought not to have been suffered in peace ; and that the measure was but just complete, which punctilio and prudence would admit, exactly on the 18th of September 1761, tho' Lord Bristol intimates, that greater insolence was shewn in General Wall's paper of January 1761, than in the last, which was received by Mr. Pitt.

As

As so much has been said concerning the time suffered to elapse before the decision of our Spanish affairs, by a certain Gentleman and his friends, can they have pretence for blaming those, who shall retort on them their censures, and convince them, that the war, which they carry on with such violence against others, is capable of being removed to their own doors *. — What then shall we say, if, on strict examination, it should appear, that this very Gentleman, who has raised his voice so high on this occasion, has been himself the most deficient in this respect? You will say, How can this be? Did he not cry aloud for a war? did he not break with the ministry? did he not fly in the face of Majesty, because he could not succeed in this purpose? All this we acknowledge; but are such always the most free of guilt, who raise the greatest clamour? In com-

* Those who have glass in their houses, should be cautious how they begin throwing stones.

mon life, is this looked on as a certain test of innocence? Is not the contrary practice every day followed, to a degree of being noted by a proverbial expression, though too coarse to be repeated here? Is it not a common art to create disorder, thereby to facilitate escape? Mr. Pitt shewed himself violent, I own, for a Spanish war; so violent, that many wished, and perhaps wish still, that he had not shewn himself so violent. But when? the 18th of September 1761. Had Mr. Pitt, whose province, whose business and duty it was, incumbent on him from the station which he held in the state, discovered in time the intrigues and treaty carried on between France and Spain, which were most probably formed into an actual engagement before January 1761. (The D. de Choiseul acknowledges, that there were engagements taken with Spain *before* the 26th of March, that is, before the overtures from France, and Lord Bristol's letter of August 31st, received September the 11th, declaring,

ing, that the stile of General Wall's enclosed paper (which gave so much offence to Mr. Pitt) was less peevish, than what was so strongly exhibited in January preceding, furnisheth great probability, that those engagements existed, at least at that time, and perhaps long before ; which engagements must have likewise been preceded by a course of negotiation. If then Mr. Pitt had, by proper diligence, discovered what was in agitation between the two courts, perhaps the French schemes might have been rendered abortive, *by the abilities of so great a statesman* ; had he discovered those transactions, even so late as when they were first grown up into settled engagements, a categorical answer might have been demanded on the same footing on which it was at last put, and the affair brought to an issue, justified in every step by prudence, *long before* the time, when his eyes were first opened *for him*, with regard to the existence of such engagements.

If

If he had been possessed of timely circumspection, and penetration, he would have had no need to have complained (with an angry acknowledgment of having been duped) that the engagements of Spain and France *had been as disingenuously suppressed*, as they were in the *moment insolently produced*. I make no question, that endeavours will not be wanting to transfer that blame, which on this account must necessarily rest on some one, to some other shoulders, in case of Mr. P---'s. It has been the fashion, I own; but it is now somewhat out of date, to attribute to him whatever was right; to others, whatever was wrong. This was a happy situation, it must be confessed; and was of singular use in German affairs, till the people becoming habituated to them, that mask was fairly thrown aside. In the present case, I will leave others to decide, whether a Secretary of State is not as answerable for the conduct of a Minister sent abroad, as a General for the behaviour of a subordinate officer sent on a

E

party,

party, when the Minister is nominated with the approbation of the Secretary, and a course of business gives him an opportunity of putting his abilities to the proof? But, independent of this question, I will venture to assert, that it is a Secretary's duty to employ spies and emissaries of his own in all courts of Europe within his department, and that there ought to have been such employed even at the court of France, at the court of France preferable to all the courts of Europe, for there one might expect to find the source of any evil machinations against Great Britain; that, in general, Secretaries can themselves have very little share in procurement of intelligence (the great object of their office) but by such means. Ambassadors, where they reside, may make good middle-men, between Secretaries and their spies; but the life and spirit of business proceed from the Secretary: he ought to be the *primum mobile*, and infuse vigour thro' the whole. Small is the merit of a Secretary, who, resembling a dead letter-box in a
post-

post-office, is merely the cold receptacle of what news shall happen to be sent to him ; an active Secretary ought to be at work, in gaining the clue, and unravelling the secrets and negotiations of foreign states,

Can it be supposed, that the Spaniard has been idle all this while, from before January to the latter part of July, during which time our Minister never dreamt of hostile intentions ? It had been more to the purpose, if, instead of giving old stale accounts, the author of the Observations had exhibited some state of Spain, and its dominions, at the latter part of the last year, on some good authority. Perhaps his patron, as capable as some figure him to be, had it not to furnish, though at that time in a station where that knowledge was requisite.—Can any thing be more ridiculous, than people just awaked out of their sleep, raving and crying, Let us haste, let us make hurry to surprise those, to take those unawares, who have taken their own

time for awaking us? For till the Duke de Choiseul thought fit to twitch our dormant Minister by the ear, he was in perfect ignorance of these important affairs.—Was it possible, that, amongst many other (perhaps stronger) motives, this circumstance of the unspeakable supineness of a reputed able Minister could have any weight, with those who endeavoured to precipitate us into a war with Spain? Was there any pique, on being so long duped? Any hope of covering it from the eyes of the world, by cutting short the affair? Perhaps the weakest thing (for many reasons) ever done by a ministry, was that act, which gave admittance to Mr. Buffy into this country, where he did an infinite deal of mischief, and in no respect were our affairs advanced by it. I acknowledge the Observator's humour in the frontispiece, proposed to be worked up by Hogarth; but could not the same artist find in some other transactions, wherewithal to furnish out a curious picture of a fly-visag'd Frenchman, laughing, and sneer-

sneering at an angry minister, looking too somewhat filly, whom he had long abused, and had just made acquainted with engagements, all complete and finished, nearly respecting his master's interest, of which, notwithstanding to that minute, he knew not a syllable.—Is this the man, who has watched, night and day, over the affairs of state? In whose praise so many tongues have been * *bired* to cry aloud? With whose applause three kingdoms have re-founded?—One cannot say,

Who would not laugh, if such a man there be?

for the misfortunes of one's country form too melancholy an object to occasion laughter. But one might say,

Who would not weep, if Billy P— be he?

* See two pamphlets, entitled, An address to the city of London; and, The continuation of the address.

F I N I S.

